



Citation for published version:

Francombe-Webb, J, Rich, E & De Pian, L 2014, 'I move like you... But different: Biopolitics and embodied methodologies', *Cultural Studies <=> Critical Methodologies*, vol. 14, no. 5, pp. 471-482.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708614541891>

DOI:

[10.1177/1532708614541891](https://doi.org/10.1177/1532708614541891)

Publication date:

2014

Document Version

Early version, also known as pre-print

[Link to publication](#)

(C) Sage 2014. Published version Francombe-Webb, J, Rich, E & De Pian, L 2014, 'I move like you... But different: Biopolitics and embodied methodologies' *Cultural Studies - Critical Methodologies*, vol 14, no. 5, pp. 471-482, available online via: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1532708614541891>

University of Bath

Alternative formats

If you require this document in an alternative format, please contact:
openaccess@bath.ac.uk

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

I Move Like You . . . But Different: Biopolitics & Embodied Methodologies

Abstract

Our aim in this paper is to throw light on the complexity of the presence of the researcher's body in the context of conducting research on and within biopolitical governance. To do so, we present author body-narratives derived from two separate research studies, both of which explore biopolitics in some way and draw on an embodied methodology. These literary narratives point towards the corporeal contradictions of being located within a culture of reading and critiquing bodies while realising the presence of our own physicality. We argue that methodological reflection on the connections between bodies within the research field and beyond, ought to rest high amongst the list of things shaping the future of work related to biopolitics or we risk the "effacement of the body" (Paechter, 2011, p. 311). We articulate this in two key ways. Firstly, we engage the cultural identities of ourselves and the individuals we encounter, extending this to examine the emplacement of the fleshy bodies of researchers. We offer reflections on the complexities of the emplacement of our researcher bodies in time, space and place (Pink, 2011) and advance a politics of reflexivity that sheds light on how we experience, make claims and speak about embodiment and physical culture within contemporary biopolitical regimes. Secondly, as scholars who seek to disrupt biopolitical forces and attempt to transcend political and disciplinary boundaries, we consider the presence of the body in a process of border crossing (Giroux, 1992). We cannot simply consider border crossing as an exchange of ideas, knowledge and practices, rather we explore the ways in which the presence of our sometimes 'normative' bodies can seemingly complicate and contradict our political agenda.

Keywords: biopolitics, border crossing, embodiment, gender, obesity

Introduction

In this paper, we contemplate advancing the study of biopolitics through returning to some long standing debates concerning the presence of the researcher's body in critical interpretive research methodologies. Giardina and Newman (2011, p. 531) believe there is more to the physical cultural studies enterprise than just doing "body work" (i.e., conducting critical investigations of the body as material form, semiotic system, contested formation, artifact of culture and so forth). They, argue that research on the body needs to better engage with an awareness and understanding of the researcher's embodied self and the "way in which our bodies are intimately articulated and necessarily contingent to that which you study" (ibid, p. 531). We attempt to advance these discussions in the context of conducting research on and within biopolitical governance. We strive to do this in two key ways. Firstly, following Rodriguez and Boahere (2012) we engage the cultural identities of ourselves and the individuals we encounter, extending this to examine the emplacement of the fleshy bodies of researchers. We offer reflections on the complexities of the emplacement of our researcher bodies in time, space and place (Pink, 2011) with others' bodies. In doing so, we consider the shift from a methodology of embodiment to an embodied methodology (Bairner, 2011) in the context of doing research on biopolitics. Secondly, in addressing a caveat in this methodological literature, we extend the above debates from the process of undertaking research into the contexts of dissemination and public engagement. When interrogating biopolitics and physical culture a number of scholars seek to challenge technologies of bioscientific and biotechnical control through engaging in processes of border crossing and traversing disciplinary and political boundaries (Giroux, 1992). They have sought to weaken rather than consolidate disciplinary boundaries in work related to the body (Evans & Davies, 2011; Gard, 2011; Mansfield & Rich, 2013; Tinning, 2012, Thorpe, 2012). Indeed, the authors contributing to a special issue of social theories of embodiment all suggest that "understanding social inequalities and processes of embodiment might well benefit from further border crossings" (Evans & Davies, 2011, p. 271). Yet, the presence of the fleshy material body in enabling or constraining that process of border crossing is seldom explored. Since the sociological turn to the body in 1990s issues of embodiment have variously returned to and invigorated questions of the presence of the body and its corporeality (Shilling, 2005) leading to calls for a 'body focus' (Armour, 1999), renewed conceptualisations of embodiment (Evans & Davies, 2011), and cautions towards the "effacement of the body" (Paechter,

2011, p. 311). Thus, we argue that the challenges of border crossing do not rest solely on finding a mutual language for the exchange of ideas and knowledge. Rather it is interpolated by the messy entanglement of our bodies, connected with other bodies, as we attempt to traverse contexts in which they are variously called into question, utilised, harnessed, regarded and simultaneously misrepresented in relation to our political and research agendas.

Collectively our research lends itself very well to exploration of these issues and prompts us to reflect on how “(o)ur modes of knowing [are] being transformed by the very processes that we wish to study” (Hannam et al 2006, p. 10). Our different research interests coalesce more broadly around global discourses of health and the narrowly read implications of these in terms of diet and exercise behaviours and young females’ presentation of the self. In researching the ways that bodies are governed, the performative, creative, (in)active, (un)healthy bodies that we research, have brought to the fore a number of questions about the physical as a primary terrain for the articulation of power and bios that are not only contextually and temporally specific but also manifest themselves upon the researchers’ body across various stages of the research process. Within this paper we emphasise the ways in which biopower “privileges and marginalizes, empowers and disciplines” (Holmer Nadesan, 2008, p. 5) across differing methodological scenarios and consider the effect of this on the relationships that develop throughout the research process and our efforts to impact the field. Subsequently we are looking to establish a “new relationship between ontology and politics” (Lazarrato, 2006, p. 11).

In order to unpack these interrelations we present two experiential accounts that are situated firmly within the analytical space that emerges when physical cultural studies intersects with critically informed research methodologies. These accounts are an excavation of the complexities of researching everyday experiences of biopolitical governmentality whilst recognising the presence of our own physicality and the consequences for our theorising of the management of health, wellbeing, power and contemporary subjectivities. Our intention here is not to rehearse nor debate the empirical and theoretical approaches to biopolitics as a process as this has been done elsewhere (Wright & Harwood, 2009; authors in this issue). However, out of necessity we offer a brief overview of our use and understanding of the concept so that we are able to

examine how our own researcher bodies—when and where—come to bear on the possibilities and conceptions of moving ‘biopolitics’.

Considering Corporeality: Researching Biopower & Biopedagogies

Lee and Motzkau (2011) highlight that governments have long been concerned with biopolitics and as the population are centralized throughout political thought the perseverance of life has become a primary concern (Cole, 1993). The term governmentality sought to draw attention to a certain way of thinking and acting embodied in all those attempts to know and to govern the wealth, health and happiness of populations. But this is a contingent claim to know the body, one that is fraught with tensions about what is means to be healthy and which bodies are worth protecting. Responses are numerous and manifest in attempts to monitor, predict, judge, record and correct human action—human life (Best & Kellner, 1991). No trip to the doctors—whatever the complaint or ailment may be—is now complete without your weight and height being recorded and/or without you being asked numerous questions with regard to your lifestyle habits: do you smoke? How many units of alcohol do you consume weekly? What is more there are a proliferation of self-help television programmes purporting pseudo expertise on anything from the diagnosis and treatment of embarrassing bodies, to advice and guidance on diet, exercise, fashion—a far from exhaustive list.

In our own research we have variously demonstrated the ways in which biopolitical trajectories related to the ordering of life processes are reconceptualised through biopedagogies (Evans et al, 2008). This is not a new conceptualisation per se—it is in fact a reiteration of the anatomo-political (Milchman & Rosenberg, 2005) relations between the macro-surveillance of the populous and the diffuse micro-politics of the body—but it does demand, as Harwood (2009, p. 15 our emphasis) proposes we should, our examination of both “the pedagogical practices *and* the effects of biopower, and how in our contemporary contexts these practices work to govern bodies.” This theorising enables us to attend to the nuances of the governance of whole populations on the one hand whilst simultaneously contending with the individualised learning of the body and:

meanings associated with the body and how these are constituted in multiple ‘pedagogic sites’—that is, sites that have the power to teach, to engage ‘learners’ in meaning making practices that they use to make sense of their worlds and their selves and thereby influence how they act on themselves and others (Wright, 2009, p. 7).

We explore the ways people learn about their health and what it means to be a ‘desirable’ subject and we conceptualise the power of these biopedagogies and the way they subject, classify, categorise, objectify (and subjectify) the ‘self’ and ‘other’. Therefore our embodied methodologies ask how our bodies connect with and are read by research participants whose bodies are governed by biopolitical forces.

In much the same way that Wright (2009) and Giroux (1999) highlight the ways in which pedagogic sites transcend formal learning spaces and are everywhere (popular cultural products we consume and create [on the internet for example], our leisure experiences and on the television, films) we extend this to the *learning* that occurs when conducting research and the biopedagogies that are reconstituted between the researcher and the researched. The pedagogical we refer to then, is more than simply a transmission of information from one source to another but it is a relational cultural practice in which knowledge of the body is (re)produced in contextually specific ways. Biopedagogies occur in political sites that often involve the sculpting of subjectivities and within sites where experiences are given meaning and ‘value.’ Following Wright (2009), we consider that negotiating body knowledge within highly politicised research spaces cannot be conceived apart from the fleshy presence of the body and the bios that govern in the name of health, ‘normality’ and the preservation of a certain type of life.

In forwarding more ‘traditional’ notions of biopolitics and the operations of biopower, we are pointing towards the way in which an individual’s appropriation of certain discourse related to the (un)healthy and (un)desirable body “will be mediated by their personal experiences, their own embodiment, their interactions with other ways of knowing” and in relation to other bodies that reiterate or challenge “other truths and operations of power” (Wright, 2009, p. 9). And so we reflect narratively, and critically, on the

ways in which our own researching bodies were constituted in these terms; the way that our physicality was part of the meaning making that occurred. This is not to suggest that inhabiting a normative body is in and of itself is an instrument of biopower. Rather, we argue that in the work on biopolitics, too often, the body is still an “absent-presence” (Shilling, 1993, p. 99) in relation to both methodological considerations and to the promises and possibilities of ‘border crossing’ to challenge biopolitical forces. The research process is interactive by nature and is thus inevitably shaped by not only the researcher’s embodied subjectivity (born of age, gender, class and ethnicity among other things), but the way in which their embodied subjectivity *interacts* (connects, or indeed conflicts), with that of their participants (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000; Finlay, 2005). What is evident is that the body of the researcher that is at once both present and absent, made known and ushered towards the borderlands of interventionist agendas offers a level of intricacy that points towards the nuances of embodied epistemologies. These will be considered further in the following narratives.

The Politics of Privilege: A Story of *Legitimised* Bodies- Jessica Francombe

Through literary narratives and extracts from my time spent with twenty school girls I muse upon the complexities of research projects that interrogate biopolitical trajectories and yet become subsumed by conceptualisations of the researcher’s physicality. This is a literary journey that meanders through the process of departing the comfort of home, arriving at the research site and my subsequent consideration of the embodied relationships that developed and the significance of these when theorising the everyday experiences of a group of 12-13 year old girls.

I sit here, like you . . . but different

I stand here, like you . . . but different

I move like you . . . but different

I am like you . . . but different

“Dress smartly but not *teacher* smart, do you know what I mean?”

I (re)present my body, transforming it from a state of nakedness, I consider my form, a gaze befalls my figure I stand fixated . . . for a moment . . . a minute. (Re)constructing corporeal contours through clothing I sift through the rail of hanging garments, reminded of the need to negotiate the anticipated boundaries that my body will encounter.

“Dress smartly but not *teacher* smart, do you know what I mean?”

The words are darting, dancing through my head as I consult my wardrobe, what does teacher smart mean? I understand the sentiment to show a decent respect for the environment you enter and your presence as a guest within it, yet do not align yourself as a member of staff and therefore immediately distinguish yourself as prior to or above the girls; a figure of authority.

Once dressed I attend to the added extras: the hair, the makeup. I wonder does my crafting relocate my body within the complexities of contemporary femininity?

Decisions made, sculpting completed I allow myself to shift between the fluttering butterflies that tickle my tummy (reminding me of the actuality of the project) an inquisitive sense of unknowing (I wonder what the girls would be like), the connotations of a government report published today that adds a sense of *legitimacy* to my research (I must articulate this to the Head of the school) and the anticipated success that may derive from today’s first engagement in the field.

I am armed with the theoretical, conceptual and methodological arsenal to begin my assault on the research site: Franklin School. I walk, pounding the pavement, an assured stride and I arrive at an aesthetically pleasing building. A sense of immanency jolts through me.

“My name is Jess Francombe and I am here for the first Media and Body Image workshop”

I have arrived; my body collides with other bodies: administrative bodies, authoritative bodies, schooled bodies. I am designated an ‘outsider,’ my body thus marked by the name

tag hanging around my neck but I also seem to trouble the student-teacher binary. As I enter I am awash with excited and animated discussion, the girls talk, eat, drink and move around this designated space with ease, poise and self-assurance. I however nervously fumble around with microphones, laptops, a Nintendo Wii console, task cards.

“I love chicos”

“I love chicos mucho”

“Hey Jasmine did you see what Amelia wrote on facebook last night?”

“I can’t believe how funny maths was today, Al-ge-BRA, LOL”

The classroom is alive with excited chatter, moving bodies, screeches of laughter at silly, private jokes.

“Have you seen what Paris has done to her hair?”

“How upset was Amber this morning, all because she misses her mum”

“ . . . And then *he* just turned to her and said something really mean”

The classroom is filled with anxiety and anticipation, fervent discussion, glances that dance to and fro. What makes these girls sad is the fear of not being included; they are shy when around boys and worry about what they think. What makes them happy is their family and friends, a feeling of being part of the group.

My ‘becoming’ a researcher is not going as anticipated, I feel self-conscious as the girls’ eyes fixate on me; they giggle amongst themselves, about me?

About me? I introduce myself to the group through a written, spoken and illustrated personal biography. My life(style) is shared and the girls promptly begin to add their scrawling and colourful interpretation of their lives on a sheet of A3 paper. Through

personal maps I elicited stories, collective stories, individual stories; researched and researcher stories—they are layered, multifaceted they fold back on us, they engulf us; they shape us and others' comprehension of us. Our presence is felt, our bodies made known.

These are my reflections on the first day of data collection for a PhD research project into young female subjectivities, the (in)active female body and physical culture. The young female participants were engaged as partners in the research and encouraged—through activities and questioning—to de- and re-construct taken-for-granted understandings about femininity and the body. The collaborative agenda sought to facilitate conversations in which social linkages and intricate webs of power that are influential in everyday lives are not just articulated but instead are articulated *and* rendered problematic (Christians, 2005; Denzin, 2005; Kincheloe & McLaren, 2005). Like Morris-Roberts (2004, p. 221) I “consider it part of the moral responsibility of my critical feminist praxis to attempt to transfer . . . politics into practice” but—and this is the essence of this reflection—I found these aspirations were to some extent altered and halted by, for example, the girls' consumption of my corporeality. Far from suggesting that my body is not political or that the research process is somehow devoid of politics, I am referring here to the threats posed to my ability to produce critical public spaces in which action can take place (Kellner, 2001) and to act as an oppositional public intellectual who intervenes upon, confronts inequality and refuses to be defined “through the language of the market or through a discourse that abstracts cultural politics from the realm of the aesthetic or the sphere of the social” (Giroux, 2001, p. 6).

The body, *my* body, was able to speak (in)directly to the young girls and the purpose of this reflective foray is to disentangle the narratives and strip bare my own positionality because “research is an interactive process shaped by [my] personal history, biography, gender, social class, race and ethnicity” (Denzin & Lincoln, 2000, p. 4). This self-reflexive stance is advanced by Finlay (2005, p. 272) who suggests the need to engage the “researcher's embodied intersubjective relationship with the participant” and the need to problematise the researcher's investments and body images (Burns, 2003). Given this it would be remiss not to highlight my own past experiences as a British school girl now researching school girl body cultures in order to locate my body as one layer of representation among many within the “total environment” (Pink, 2011, p. 348): an intense nexus of bodies, places and biopedagogies.

So, as I embarked on a research inquiry into physical culture as it borders issues of youth, femininity, social class and race, I began to draw out the biopolitical forces that are embedded and reconstituted within specific media and technologies. It became clear that my desire to impact the field was contingent upon my own corporeality. While it would be nonsensical to proclaim that a politicised (feminist) agenda can be read into, onto or against the body's shape or size, I was struck by the ways my body—both in an explicit sense and as an unthought known (Bollas, 1987 cited in Walkerdine, 2009)—seemed to *legitimise* the persistent quest for slenderness “diverting attention from continued patterns of exclusion, subordination and normalization” (Bordo, 1993, p. 295) and restricting the girls' challenges to public perceptions.

The project that I make reference to took place over the course of a school term in Franklin School which is a private fee paying school in the West of England. The study involved weekly workshops with a group of twenty girls and deployed a creative mix of methodological strategies from drawing, writing, exploring magazines, playing the Nintendo Wii through to the creation online blogs as well as participant and parent focus groups. Throughout I kept a research diary and I often considered the way the voices heard in the workshops shifted from mine towards the girls' as they participated in activities and ‘chatted’ amongst themselves. Through this dialogue between the girls and myself, I hoped that we would be able to collectively construct alternative realities and thus through *critical corporeal closures* my research would have impact and contribute impactful knowledge (see Francombe in press). Nevertheless what I had not considered was the way my own physicality was ancillary to the success of this aspect of the research, how the meaning and knowledge that was (re)constructed, (re)constituted and made known through attendance to my body. Accordingly I influenced the power dynamics that empowered, disempowered and at times unsettled the girls; I became one of them:

That's what you are like when you are brought up you know what I mean and then there's like *us* (Charlotte)

I was struck by the way my body seemed to legitimise the girls' persistent quest for slenderness and often the girls would formulate their opinions around and through my body:

My sister she's really, well I think she used to be quite big, and in year four I think, she started losing all her weight and I was actually then I was the bigger one. And it was just

like a bit you wanted to be thin, *you know when you just want to be thin [to me]? No you probably don't know that because you're thin* but you just umm, I just sometimes I just wish I was the right size, you know what I mean? (Paris)

Within this extract my body spoke “directly or indirectly” (Del Busso, 2007, p. 311) to the girls and was ‘read’ by Paris in such a way that it was thought to impede my ability to empathise with her experiences. My apparent lack of understanding due to my own shape and size delimited the conversation and brought it to an abrupt end. Surface physicality had been read as “less resistance or even obedient to hetero-normative standards of femininity” and this served to support the girls’ “construction of their own embodied selves” (Del Busso, 2007, p.12). My interaction with the Franklin School girls was fraught with such tensions as I sought to fulfill my commitment to a politicised feminist methodology and at the same time contend with the ways that the girls seemed to ‘read’ my body. They (re)constructed the meanings of their own bodies in accordance with my own apparent conduciveness to the expectations of heterosexiness. This made me feel uneasy.

This research aimed to challenge patterns of privilege that maintain certain subject positions whilst marginalising and stigmatising those whose bodies do not ‘fit.’ The mechanisms by which the girls maintained their ‘normative’—white, middle-upper class—subjectivities were palpable; namely through calling upon the flaws and ‘inappropriateness’ of the ‘other’ body. Yet as the extracts above reveal my body was seemingly interpreted as being ‘like them’ and/or an exemplar of the slenderness that the girls strove to achieve. Harwood (2009) notes that biopedagogies impart knowledge across a diversity of ‘sites’ and these become reinvigorated through cultural practices and “being-embodied-in-the-world” (Del Busso, 2007, p. 310). My body became subsumed into a subject position that the girls aspired to and it was anticipated that I shared their desire to appear in a particular way. Utterly political but bereft of a much desired moral and ethical axiology I became one of the girls, complicit in their ‘othering’ my body heralded as an example of ‘appropriate’ femininity:

Charlotte Chav chav, normal kind of chavvy because that’s what you are like when you are brought up you know what I mean? And then there’s like *us*

Me So chav chav, chav, and *us*?

Charlotte Yeah

The girls discursively established themselves as images of ‘normality’—they worked hard educationally and aesthetically (Ringrose, 2010)—and they reaffirmed their ‘normalised’ femininity often in opposition to ‘othered’ bodies. In the extract above the ‘Chav’—an image evoked of lower class femininity—became the ‘other’ that operated to *legitimise* the girls’ ‘choices’ and behaviours and regulate the lower class female to a position on the margins. What was problematic was the way in which my ‘complicit femininity’ was used—alongside theirs—to pathologise alternative versions of girlhood and situate deviance as something removed from their subjectivity. Hence the (re)presentation of ‘desirable’ girlhood can “marginalize or render invisible many other possible ways of being a girl constituting “certain “girl” positions as unsupportable, incomprehensible with “normal” girlhood” (Griffin, 2004, p. 42). Through becoming one of *them* I questioned the influence of my border crossing (Giroux, 1992). As I stood in front of the girls, appearing as I did, was I able to make them rethink the narrow positionings of femininity they purported?

Irrespective of the answer, my body and aesthetic appearance had been positioned. I felt that my feminist politicising was at stake. I considered the effectiveness of the *critical corporeal closures* and my attempts to get the girls to imagine alternative possibilities and to conjure a sense of social justice in relation to those less fortunate—those for whom the colour and style of their ‘jeggings’¹ is perhaps of little consequence given more pressing social concerns.

As my body merged with those of the girls, with those in the magazines, with those on the screen, my earlier crafting was, once more, brought into fruition:

“Dress smartly but not *teacher* smart, do you know what I mean?”

¹ Jeggings, according to the Urban Dictionary are a “fairly recent combination in fashion, achieved when combining leggings and jeans. Available from: <http://www.urbandictionary.com/define.php?term=jeggings>.

My previous commitment to reducing power dynamics by adopting a stylised aesthetic form that was more akin to my PhD researcher status as opposed to a teacher status meant that through its visibility my physical form, dressed, coiffed and made up, was made vulnerable. Vulnerable because it lacked social democratic potential and vulnerable as I began to reflect upon my physicality and what it (re)presented about me, about wider society and discourses of femininity, health and wellbeing. The girls proclaim my slenderness, am I too thin? What does my body say about contemporary expectations for females in the conjuncture? My time, diligence and consideration had been dedicated to managing the necessary resources, the research space and whilst I was aware of the power dynamics I was looking to quell through my choice of clothing I was less prepared for the double bind this would entail. Perhaps these interactions are unavoidable facets of researching girl culture while consuming girl culture, nevertheless, reflecting on these experiences ‘in the field’ highlights the necessity for careful contemplation of the presentation of the researcher ‘self’ and a sensitivity to the ways in which the physical appearance, choice of clothing, verbal and physical communication can serve to challenge the political potential of the research in multifaceted ways.

What if you are not what you research? Disrupting biopolitics – Emma Rich

In revisiting the directions and questions of social theory, education and embodiment Evans and Davies (2011, p. 263) ‘celebrate theoretical and methodological diversity in the social sciences while calling for border crossing between the disciplined and perspectives of the social and bio-physical sciences’. This sentiment, in part, derives from Giroux’s (1992) call for academics to act as border crossers who undertake public engagement and speak across different public contexts and to a range of disciplines. Pursuing this, of course, seems beneficial to the advancement of critical interrogation and subversion of particular biopolitical forces that come to bear upon bodies in often ‘oppressive’ ways. There remain a number of challenges to this, not least the inability to find a mutual language through which to engage across site, culture and discipline, but also, as Gard (2011, p. 401) observes ‘for a range of reasons there exists an unnecessary reticence to engage with the various sciences of the body amongst many social scientists’. Our intention here is not to contemplate how best to facilitate communication across the divergent languages, ontologies and epistemologies of different disciplines. Our mission is rather more modest, albeit in keeping with the remit of this special issue: debates about border crossing, even when in the context of the

governance of the body, have yet to fully engage with the emplacement (Pink, 2011) of our bodies as researchers within and across those different sites/disciplines. A growing body of methodological literature focuses on researchers' experiences of engaging with embodied reflexivity during interactions with participants (Del Busso, 2007) and participant-researcher intersubjectivity (Finlay, 2005). Others have explored the challenges of representation' and the responsibilities of social research (Fine et al., 2000) and of what Michelle Fine (1994) has called 'working the hyphen' which attempts to interrupt othering, particularly in terms of rethinking 'how researchers have spoken 'of' and 'for' others while occluding ourselves and our investments, burying the contradictions that percolate at the self-other hyphen.' (Fine, 1994, p. 70):

I examine the hyphen at which self-other join in the politics of everyday life, that is, the hyphen that both separates and merges personal identities with our inventions of other.'

Questions have also been raised about how to write oneself as researcher into the text (Sparkes, 2002). However, much less has been written about this process in relation to the politics of the researcher's body (Giardina & Newman, 2011) and engaging with communities, undertaking border crossing and the lived experience of speaking for and about other's bodies (particularly important when doing so in an attempt to disrupt biopolitical forces); specifically, drawing on Coleman (2008) we focus here not on what the researcher's body means but what it *does* in relation with other bodies within particular assemblages (Deleuze & Guattari, 1987). It may be incumbent for researchers to extend the application of embodied reflexivity as they traverse a range of public contexts and disciplines and the biopolitical significance of their own bodies in this process. As we increasingly look to explore the means by which we might weaken borders or boundaries, this reflection may become a crucial part of the process of better addressing substantive interests that are of shared concerns (e.g. improving health and well-being or achieving equity). This, we argue, could lead us towards a stronger consideration not just of the '*relations to*' the research environment but the '*relations within*' (Evans & Davies, 2006).

The focus of my research over the last decade perhaps lends itself particularly well to this discussion precisely because it is has centred on the biopedagogies of weight and health. With colleagues, I have undertaken research which has explored the experiences of young women with eating disorders (Evans et

al., 2008) whilst also undertaking what might be described as ‘critical weight studies’ exploring the social construction of obesity and its impact on embodied subjectivity (Rich et al., 2011). Both these areas of research have pointed to the deleterious impact of what has been described as an ‘obesity discourse’ and its accompanying weight-centric approach to health and moral panic. Below, I reflect on some of the biopolitical embodied interactions which were present in particular assemblages as I traversed different contexts and some of the tensions that emerged over the ‘legitimacy’ of knowledge claims. In what follows, I attempt to engage with my different embodied subjectivities as I cross a range of contexts associated with these research studies; as a critical weight studies scholar, a feminist, a researcher working in sport and physical activity, a woman, and in relation to my own body and what that comes to represent in neoliberal contexts where biopolitical governance of the body is rife.

In recent years, like many others I have sought to undertake ‘border crossing’ (Giroux, 1992) and work across ‘artificial’ barriers variously engaging with artists, scientists, health professionals, activists, journalists and a variety of academic disciplines. This in itself is not a particularly novel endeavour, and the desire to challenge ‘existing boundaries of knowledge and creating new ones’ (Giroux, 2001, p. 21) is an undertaking attempted by many others. However, when attempting to do so in relation to issues about weight and health, there have been many times where organisations, individuals and disciplines have set about to reaffirm those artificial boundaries. Ironically this is in part because of some shared conviction that seemingly oppositional groups share - that doing so is in the interests of improving the health and wellbeing of others. As Monaghan (in press) suggests, ‘the difficulty of debating obesity’ without this being seen as a ‘failure to appreciate public health’ contributes to the conditions in which crossing borders is no easy endeavour. Those who critique obesity discourse and affiliate policies and surveillant and moralised practices, often encounter opposition and sometimes this can be unexpected from those considered intellectual allies (Gard, 2009).

Perhaps one of the more extreme examples of opposition (albeit from an expected quarter but in unexpected circumstances) occurred when a colleague presented our research on young women and disordered eating at a conference related to health and obesity. The audience, comprised of teachers of PE and Health, Local Education Authority advisors and other professionals from the world of coaching and

sport, i.e., people who would potentially have significant impact on the lives of young people and how they think about their own and others' bodies. The presentation over, however, an 'eminent' spokesperson immediately arose from the audience to publicly deride the speaker, instructing the audience, without doubt or qualification, to 'disregard all that this man is saying', suggesting 'it could be damaging to the health of young people'. And this, despite the fact that the evidence being reported was the product of research that had been conducted systematically and rigorously, over a period of some years, following accepted tried and tested social science methodologies. In an instance, the anti-obesity spokesperson (one imagines with the interests of children in mind) effectively silenced and dismissed as irrelevant the voices of some 40 young women and simultaneously all that potentially was to be learned (by the attending delegates) from their experiences of 'health education' in schools. There was, however, nothing new or unusual in this 'authority's' dismissive attitudes toward 'facts' that either challenged, contradicted, or interrupted received wisdom in the obesity field. He, sadly, like other advocates of obesity discourse, appear affronted, indeed, very frightened by the messages that studies such as ours, and those of others, may be sending to the public. Monaghan's (in press) suggestion that a mutually reflexive dialogue between interested parties is 'crucial if we are to ever avoid naïve realism and move beyond the reduction of the debate to crude and questionable dichotomies' is unlikely to materialise where/when vested interest combine either with ignorance of, or unwillingness to engage, 'others' science and the 'fact's that form the foundations of public health knowledge (see Gard, 2012).

But our intention here is not to further discuss the nature and authority of 'truth narratives' nor the language through which these are articulated. Rather, our mission is to reflect more closely on a different aspect of the way in which knowledge may come to be obfuscated when crossing borders: via the varied embodied subjectivities we as researchers bring to our knowledge claims against the backdrop described above. Reflecting on contributions to *Biopolitics and the 'Obesity Epidemic'* Walkerdine (2009) observes that critical scholarship is often ignored by the obesity mainstream. Making connections within and across communities of obesity sceptics has therefore been important in mobilizing scholarship to challenge obesity discourse. Yet, as Gard (2011, p. 109) suggests, this is by no means a coherent intellectual collective:

‘I use the term ‘obesity sceptics’ partly for convenience to talk about a disparate set of writers. In their different ways they have sought to argue against part or all of the dominant obesity story [...] but is also true that sceptics, no less than alarmists, often think in ways that are the product and prisoner of pre-existing biases’

Writers and activists working within the ‘fat acceptance movement’ and the discipline of ‘fat studies’ have over the last four decades, sought to challenge oppressive regimes and systems of biopolitical subjectivity (see Cooper, 2010). Fat studies has thus emerged partly as a reaction to the pathologisation of ‘fat’. Within cultures where obesity discourse dominates, the embodied experiences of those who are at the extremes of the weight continuum are often silenced. I have experienced a great deal of collaboration and support with activists and scholars working within this field and ‘fat studies’ has made considerable efforts to celebrate heterogeneity within this field. However, returning to Gard’s point, this does not mean that all within this community approach substantive issues through the same socio-cultural, political or embodied experiences. In recent years, a number of encounters in my efforts as a border crosser have brought to the fore the contingencies of my body:

I’d just offered my critique of obesity discourse, drawing on research which offered accounts of young people’s reading of this discourse and it’s deleterious effects and affects in terms of surveillance, disordered body-self relationships and disordered relationships with food. After the event I was approached by a member of the audience, who suggested that others might find it difficult to engage with me and take my work seriously because I wasn’t fat and couldn’t really understand these experiences and that my presence might also make it difficult for others to talk about themselves openly.

It was clear my body spoke directly to those in the audience in a way that may be unsettling for some, on the one hand publicly offering a critique of obesity discourse whilst doing so through a conduit (my body) which seemed to cohere with its requirements. Following Blackman and Henn (2010, 10), my body and that of the audience members were not separate entities, but took on meaning in a process of relationality, or ‘co-emergence’. Here then, border crossing is much more than sharing of ideas, concepts and practices between the researcher and those with a vested interest, but is interpolated by connections between particular bodies.

Speaking at a fat studies conference in 2010, Dr Sam Murray talked about similar experiences as a fat studies scholar, as a feminist who identifies as being fat and as a woman who has undergone weight loss surgery:

‘As a woman who has undergone weight loss surgery I know that some sections of the fat studies and fat activist communities feel unsettled by my presence and by my claims of commitment to staging critical interventions into cultural fat phobia’ ‘as emblematic of this very fat phobia’ (Murray, 2010)

Elsewhere Kehily (2004, p. 366) writes about the tensions of conducting research with girls and her discomfort “knowing what I do about body image, fat and self-regulation.” Such tensions have troubled and complicated our own research, leading us to ask; does embodying a normative body type undermine the ability of the researcher to critique the ways in which normativity is constructed through biopolitics? Despite my commitment towards challenging anti-obesity policy and its moralising and surveillant tendencies towards young people’s bodies, my embodied subjectivity was being positioned by others in ways that were deemed to be less resistant, normative in such a way as to destabilize the research itself such that it ‘could be read within the context of fat politics as problematic at best and invalid at worse’ (Murray, 2010).

After this encounter, I became increasingly aware that for some my body was ‘emblematic of this very fat phobia’ (Murray, 2010) and became more conscious of my body when attending future events: how to present it, whether to offer confessional accounts of my engagement with sport and physical activity; whether to pre-empt questions about my body. Should I remain silent about the pleasure I derive from working out in the gym?

Conversely, when presenting a paper on the experiences of young women with anorexia, I have frequently been asked if I had ‘personal’ experience of anorexia, and I would often feel the presence of the eyes of the inquirer gliding over my body as they ask. Some have asked directly, others begin a more indirect interrogation of my experience with exercise and food, leading to questions of my ‘personal’ interest in anorexia, again reflecting the discussion back to my own body and my ability to ‘relate’ to the young women in my research.

Conferences and public engagement lunches have taken on a different meaning. I have experienced jokes about my presentations giving licence to not feel guilty about therefore 'indulging' in rich foods at conferences or how it was possible for me to eat so much yet 'not be fat'. Colleagues watching what I eat and make connections with my research interests. Increasingly those I encounter (some of which included young men/women who had previously experience eating disorders) asking me if I had experienced anorexia or problems with food. I have become acutely aware that my involvement in this research is prompting suspicions about my embodied self but also about my relationship with the participants and the legitimacy of my voicing their experiences. Time and again I would struggle with pre-empting these questions and whether to acknowledge that I have no experience of disordered eating, anorexia or bulimia. Yet, so too this dilemma positions me away from the 'we' that legitimised my speaking about these experiences, leaving me ambivalent about my place as researcher. (Research Diary)

Thus, following Giardina and Newman (2011, p. 527) the body of the researcher enters into a particular 'body polity' and 'in this way, the body how we use it and think about its uses, is contested and contestable - constantly negotiating the interests of the self and of others, entangled in a web of politics and power relationships'. Both accounts above speak to the longstanding methodological debates about subjectivity and the question as to whether overlapping experience necessarily leads to some privilege or shared understanding. This is an issue which has similarly troubled the disability movement and the 'culture of suspicion surrounding academics' (Humphrey, 2000, p. 63):

"This analysis lends itself to a dichotomy between non-disabled and disabled people which becomes coterminous with the dichotomy between oppressors and oppressed; and this tightens the boundaries around the disabled identity, the disabled people's movement and disability research" (Humphrey, 2000, p. 63)

Lived experiences of a particular inequality, oppression or embodied subjectivity is perhaps not a pre-requisite for undertaking research on that substantive issue, but collectively these experiences have alluded to the ways in which my contingent body in these knowledge exchanges is takes place within a broader biopolitics. As Kitzinger & Wilkinson (1996, p. 24) observes, researchers:

continue to struggle with questions of overlapping categories and shifting identities in their discussion of who 'we' are and who the Other is. "We" doesn't really get one very far' says Barabara

Katz Rothman: ‘We who’?... is it age, race, sexual orientation(s), reproductive history, familial status, education or job situation?

How many of us as researchers keep a research diary reflecting on embodied interactions with our audiences? Yet these interactions have produced a series of questions for us about the power relationships and the ‘borders’ (Giroux, 1992) we feel exist when we take ourselves, our contingent *bodies*, into these contexts. It is our contention that our lived experiences and fleshy bodies in these contexts matter as part of the process of subverting or interrogating biopolitical forces. It does not end at the data collection, or writing up of our research. What often remains absent in these discussions is our lived experience of our bodily being as we, the researchers, present our research in efforts to undertake border crossing. Due to space, I have barely touched upon a sort of critical self-narrative about my situatedness in traversing different contexts of knowledge where weight is the focus for critical discussion. Nor have I explored in any detail how I negotiate the varying discursive powers as I enter different assemblages of knowledge. However, the above reflections allude to the call for researchers to do so.

A Critical Commentary on *Bionormality*

“Consideration of the workings of truth power and modes of subjectification thus take shape as analytic tools for interrogating biopower’s pedagogies of life” (Harwood, 2009, p. 23).

In this paper we have endeavoured to critically reflect upon the way our own researcher bodies, have moved within and across systems of biopolitical subjectivity that intercede upon the constitution of knowledge. As we undertake critical interrogations of how our research participants learn about their bodies through biopedagogies (Wright & Harwood, 2009) it seems incumbent that as researchers we also consider how those very processes also impact upon the positioning of our bodies within biopolitical regimes and the implications of this. In ‘moving biopolitics’, we thus advocate for an embodied researcher reflexivity that extends beyond intersubjectivity in the field and the politics of voice. As Giardina and Newman (2011) argue, focusing on the relationship between the body and the research act might contribute to our understandings of the ‘the body’. We have rendered ourselves, our motivations, our corporeal cognitions available for scrutiny and thus this paper could be envisaged as part of what Fine et al. (2000) describe as our self-reflexive critical conscience that asks whether consideration has been given to “who the researcher

would be afraid to see these analyses” and who is made “vulnerable/responsible or exposed” (Silk & Andrews, 2011, p. 24). The multiplicity of interpretations exposed by permitting these impulses to be made visible/audible through our critical dialogues and narrative musings is a central feature of the crystallisation that binds and reiterates the entrenched discourse of power that are fundamental to our ontological, epistemological, methodological positions and the ways in which these impact upon the questions asked by and of our projects (Richardson, 2000; Silk & Andrews, 2011). Returning to the specific theme of this special issue, this is not just about the moral and ethical issues or representing the ‘other’s’ voice and experiences, but about recognising the expansion of biopolitics as it provokes questions about *who* can be a *legitimate* knower (Maton, forthcoming). It is about excavating how audiences respond to the research claims that do not just intersect with issues of gender, class and ethnicity, but relate specifically to contemporary contexts where size, shape and weight are subject to biopolitical governance. We hope to have shown how claims to know, understand and critique the body overlap, especially given the ways that “knowledge circulates globally” yet is “picked up and worked with and over differently” and complexly (Walkerline, 2009, p. 200).

The researchers’ body and the conceptual and emotional experiences of the body that are simultaneously re-engaged and reconstituted offer an interpretation of the politics of researching the body and its (feminised) aesthetic performance in a climate of obeseogenic discourses of crisis and ‘choice.’ In each case our bodies are read as ‘normative’ given the present cultures of appearance and slenderness that circulate and this was not without consequence for the ways in which this body was understood by those we research about, for and with. For instance, in reflecting on the preparation and everydayness of the first day at the research site, the presence of a *legitimate* body within Jess’ reflections served to strengthen and enhance the discourses of femininity that permit certain actions, attitudes, behaviours and assert or justify positions of power and ‘normality’. Relatedly, in the final commentary Emma’s contingent corporeality was being read within the biopolitics of knowledge construction and the value of the knowledge transferred was questioned as a result of the body through which it was (re)presented. The work was judged on the basis of the researcher’s body and the e/affectiveness of the alternative pedagogies put forward were impacted by her corporeality and the participants’ consideration that it was symbolic of the very biopolitical regimes governing and stigmatising their bodies and subjectivities. So our bodies were at once complicit with and

contradictory to the expectations of our research participants. Our bodies became unavoidably part of the sense making that occurred, be that by the Franklin School girls, those whose bodies are described as pathological or us as scholars and aspiring border crossers. We have taken seriously the way we were positioned in a theoretical and everyday sense within the work we do, we have struggled with our integrity and we have not shied away from these experiences. Whether our narratives are written from the perspective of 'I', 'we' or 'us' the aim has been to produce knowledge that is both related to our emotive and individualised responses *and* speaks to the wider academic community researching particular biopolitical systems and biopedagogies. In other words, this paper matters not just because it is about what the researcher's body might come to signify in these systems, but about what it *does* relationally (Coleman, 2008) in terms of the constitution of knowledge.

Stepping back from and reflecting upon our collective experiences has presented us with an opportunity to explore the emplacement (Pink, 2011) of our bodies and the ways in which the research questions we asked, the issues we raised and the lines of analysis we developed impacted upon our comprehension(s) of the body as in a state of becoming (Coleman, 2008). Moreover, these new ways of (embodied) knowing that refute the simple relations between regulation and subject as well as the dissonance related to our own physical appearance (Walkerline, 2009; Wesley, 2003) unsettled our contribution to knowledge about the operation of biopower. This then is about the complexity of body knowledge and claims to know the body that are agitated by research projects that look beyond theorisation and hold aspirations for collaboration, intervention and public engagement/border crossing.

References

- Armour, K. M. (1999) The case for a body-focus in education and physical education. *Sport Education and Society*, 4 (1), 5-15
- Best, S., & Kellner, D. (1991). *Postmodern Theory: Critical Interrogations*. New York: Guilford Press.
- Bordo, S. (1993). Feminism, Foucault and the politics of the body. In C. Ramazanoglu (ed.), *Up Against Foucault: Explorations of Some Tensions Between Foucault and Feminism* (pp. 139-164). London: Routledge.
- Bairner, A. E. S. (2011). Urban walking and pedagogies of the street. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16 (3), 371-384,
- Blackman, L. & Venn, C. (eds) (2010). Affect. Special issue of *Body & Society*, 16 (1), 1-28.
- Burns, M. (2003). Interviewing: Embodied communication. *Feminism & Psychology*, 13 (2), 229-36.

- Christians, C. G. (2005). Ethics and politics in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed pp. 139-164). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Cole, C. L. (1993). Resisting the canon: feminist cultural studies, sport, and technologies of the body. *Journal of Sport & Social Issues*, 17 (2), 77-97.
- Coleman, R. (2008). The Becoming of Bodies. *Feminist Media Studies*, 8 (2), 163-179
- Cooper, C. (2007) 'Headless Fatties' [Online]. Lond
- Cooper (2010) Fat Studies: Mapping the Field' *Sociology Compass*. 4(12), 1020-1034
- Del Busso, L. (2007). Embodying feminist politics in the research interview: Material bodies and reflexivity. *Feminism & Psychology*, 17 (3), 309-315.
- Deleuze, G., & Guattari, F. (1987). *A thousand plateaus: Capitalism and schizophrenia*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Denzin, N. K. (2005). Emancipatory discourses and the ethics and politics of interpretation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed pp. 933-958). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Denzin, N. K., & Lincoln, Y. S. (2000). Introduction: the discipline and practice of qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed pp. 1-28). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Evans, J. & Davies, B. (2006) 'Social class and physical education', in D. Kirk, D. Macdonald & M. O'Sullivan (eds) *The Handbook of Physical Education*, (pp. 796- 808). London: Sage
- Evans, J., & Davies, B. (2011). New directions, new questions? Social theory, education and embodiment. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16 (3), 263-278
- Evans, J., Rich, E., Davies, B., & Allwood, R. (2008) *Education, Disordered Eating and Obesity Discourse: Fat Fabrications*. Routledge, London and New York.
- Fine, M., Weiss, L., Weseen, S., & Wong, L. (2000). For whom? Qualitative research, representations and social responsibilities. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (2nd ed pp. 107-133). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Fine, M. (1994). Working the hyphen: Reinventing self and other in qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin, and Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (pp. 70-82). Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Finlay, L. (2005). "Reflexive embodied empathy": A phenomenology of participant-researcher intersubjectivity. *The Humanist Psychologist*, 33 (4), 271-292.
- Francombe, J. (2013 in press). Methods that move: A physical performative pedagogy of subjectivity. *Sociology of Sport Journal*.
- Gard, M. (2011). A meditation in which consideration is given to the past and future engagement of social science generally and critical physical education and sports scholarship in particular with various scientific debates, including the so-called 'obesity epidemic' and contemporary manifestations of biological determinism. *Sport Education and Society*, 16 (3), 399-411.
- Gard, M. (2009), 'Friends, enemies and the cultural politics of critical obesity research', in J Wright & V Harwood (eds), *Biopolitics and the 'obesity epidemic': governing bodies*, Routledge, New York, pp. 31-44
- Gard, M. (2012). Disagreement not misrecognition: A reply to Monaghan. *Social Theory & Health*, 11, 106-115.

- Giardina, M., & Newman, J. (2011). Physical cultural studies and embodied research acts. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 11 (6), 523-534
- Giroux, H.A. (1992). *Border Crossings*. London: Routledge.
- Giroux, H. A. (1999). *The Mouse that Roared: Disney and the End of Innocence*. Lanham, Md, Rowman & Littlefield.
- Giroux, H. A. (2001). Cultural studies as performative politics. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1 (1), 5-23.
- Griffin, C. (2004). Good girls, bad girls: Anglocentrism and diversity in the constitution of contemporary girlhood. In A. Harris (ed.), *All About the Girl: Culture, Power and Identity* (pp. 29-44). Oxon: Routledge.
- Hannam, K., Sheller, M., & Urry, J. (2006). Editorial: Mobilities and Moorings. *Mobilities*, 1 (1), 1-22
- Harwood, V. (2009). Theorizing biopedagogies. In J. Wright., & V, Harwood (eds.), *Biopolitics and the Obesity Epidemic* (pp. 15-30). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Holmer Nadesan, M. (2008). *Governmentality, Biopower and Everyday Life*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Humphrey, J. C. (2000). Researching disability politics, or, some problems with the social model in practice. *Disability & Society*, 15 (1), 63-86
- Kellner, D. (2001). Critical pedagogy, cultural studies, and radical democracy at the turn of the millennium: Reflections on the work of Henry Giroux. *Cultural Studies ↔ Critical Methodologies*, 1 (2), 221-239.
- Kincheloe, J. L., & McLaren, P. (2005). Rethinking critical theory and qualitative research. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (eds.), *Handbook of Qualitative Research* (3rd ed pp. 303-342). London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Kehily, M. J. (2004). Gender and sexuality: Continuities and change for girls in school. In A. Harris (ed.), *All About the Girl: Culture, Power and Identity* (pp. 205-218). London: Routledge.
- Kitzinger, C., & Wilkinson, S. (1996). Theorizing representing the other. In S. Wilkinson & C. Kitzinger (eds.), *Representing the Other- A Feminism and Psychology Reader* (pp. 1-31). London: Sage.
- Lazzarato, M. (2006). From biopower to biopolitics. *Tailoring Biotechnologies*, 2 (2), 11-20.
- Lee, N., & Motzkau, J. (2011). Navigating the bio-politics of childhood. *Childhood*, 18 (1), 7-19.
- Mansfield, L., & Rich, E. (2013, in press). Public health pedagogy, border crossings and physical activity at every size. *Critical Public Health*.
- Maton, K. (forthcoming) *Knowledge and Knowers: Towards a Realist Sociology of Education*. London, Routledge.
- Milchman, A., & Rosenberg, A. (2005). Michel Foucault: Crises and problematizations. *The Review of Politics*, 67 (2), 335-351.
- Monaghan, L. (in press). Extending the obesity debate, repudiating misrecognition: Politicising fatness and health (practice). *Social Theory and Health*.
- Morris-Roberts, K. (2004). Colluding in compulsory heterosexuality? Doing research with young women at school. In A. Harris (ed.), *All About the Girl: Culture, Power, and Identity* (pp. 219-232). London: Routledge.
- Murray, S. (2010). *Lived Ambiguities: Fat Political Selves and Weight Loss Surgery*. Paper presented at 3rd ESRC fat studies seminar: Experiencing and Celebrating Fatness 18th - 19th November, 2010. London

- Paechter, C. (2011). Gender, visible bodies and schooling: Cultural pathologies of childhood. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16 (3), 309-322.
- Pink, S. (2011). From embodiment to emplacement: Re-thinking competing bodies, senses and spatialities. *Sport, Education and Society*, 16 (3), 343-355.
- Rich, E., Evans, J., and De-Pian, L. (2011) Children's' Bodies, Surveillance and The Obesity Crisis. In E.Rich, L.F.Monaghan and L.Aphramor (Eds) *Debating Obesity: Critical Perspectives*. Palgrave. 139-163
- Ringrose, J. (2010). Sluts, whores, fat slags and playboy bunnies: Teen girls' negotiations of 'sexy' on social networking sites and at school. In C. Jackson, C. Paechter & E. Renold (eds.), *Girls and Education 3-16: Continuing Concerns, New Agendas* (pp. 170-182). Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Rodriguez, D., & Boahene, A. (2012). The politics of rage. Empowering women of color in the academy. *Cultural Studies <-> Critical Methodologies*, 12 (5), 450-458.
- Shilling, C. (1993). *The Body and Social Theory*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Shilling, C. (2005). *The Body in Culture, Technology and Society*. London: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Silk, M. L., & Andrews, D. L. (2011). Toward a physical cultural studies. *Sociology of Sport Journal*, 28 (1), 4-35.
- Sparkes, A. C. (2002). Autoethnography: Self-indulgence or something more? In A. P. Bochner & C. Ellis (eds.), *Ethnographically Speaking: Autoethnography, Literature and Aesthetic* (pp. 209-232). Walnut Creek, CA: AltaMira Press.
- Thorpe, H. (2012). Moving bodies beyond the social/biological divide: Toward theoretical and transdisciplinary adventures. *Sport, Education and Society*, DOI: 10.1080/13573322.2012.691092
- Tinning, R. (2012). *Sport Pedagogy Research: A Perspective on Intra-Disciplinary and Inter-Disciplinary Possibilities*, paper presented at ECER 2012, The Need for Educational Research to Champion Freedom, Education and Development for All Time, Cadiz, 2012-09-18.
- Walkerdine, V. (2009). Biopedagogies and beyond. In J. Wright., & V, Harwood (eds.), *Biopolitics and the Obesity Epidemic* (pp. 199-208). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Wesely, J. K. (2003). Exotic dancing and the negotiation of identity. The multiple uses of body technologies. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography*, 32 (6), 643-669.
- Wright, J. (2009). Biopower, biopedagogies & the obesity epidemic. In J. Wright., & V, Harwood (eds.), *Biopolitics and the obesity epidemic* (pp. 21-14). Oxon, UK: Routledge.
- Wright, J., & Harwood, V. (eds.) (2009). *Biopolitics and the Obesity Epidemic*. Oxon, UK: Routledge.